

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

(A)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/617,897	10/617,897 07/10/2003		Amr Fahim	030288	4071	
23696	7590	07/19/2005		EXAMINER		
Qualcom	m Incorpo	rated	ZWEIZIG, JEFFERY SHAWN			
	epartment ehouse Driv	∕e	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
San Diego, CA 92121-1714				2816		
				DATE MAILED: 07/19/200:	DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/617,897	FAHIM, AMR	FAHIM, AMR			
Office Ad	tion Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Jeffrey S. Zweizig	2816				
The MAILING Period for Reply	DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence ac	ddress			
A SHORTENED STATE MAILING DATE  - Extensions of time may be after SIX (6) MONTHS fro  - If the period for reply spec  - If NO period for reply is spec  - Failure to reply within the same reply received by the	ATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. on the mailing date of this communication. if ified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rejectified above, the maximum statutory period set or extended period for reply will, by statu Office later than three months after the mailinent. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, ma oly within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) Note, cause the application to becom	y a reply be timely filed  thirty (30) days will be considered time MONTHS from the mailing date of this of a ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to	communication(s) filed on 10.	<i>July 2003</i> .	•				
2a) This action is I		s action is non-final.		•			
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ 1-14 7) ☐ Claim(s) 15 is 6	and 16-28 is/are rejected.	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers	·						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) Applicant may r Replacement dr	on is objected to by the Examin filed on 10 July 2003 is/are: a sot request that any objection to the awing sheet(s) including the correctaration is objected to by the E	) $\square$ accepted or b) $\boxtimes$ obe drawing(s) be held in abection is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119						
a) All b) So  1. Certified  2. Certified  3. Copies of applications.	ent is made of a claim for foreigome * c) None of: I copies of the priority document copies of the priority document the certified copies of the priority document of the certified copies of the priority document the certified copies of the priority document the local copies of the	nts have been received. Its have been received in the print of the pri	n Application No een received in this National	l Stage			
Attachment(s)	·						
1) Notice of References C			ew Summary (PTO-413)				
	s Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 //31/05.	Paper	No(s)/Mail Date  of Informal Patent Application (PTo	O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/617,897 Page 2

Art Unit: 2816

# **Drawings**

1. Fig. 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Objections

2. Claim 25 appears to be missing text. It is not clear what aspect of the invention is fabricated with CMOS technology of 0.13um or smaller.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 16-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldtkeller (6,049,201).

Note that although the Feldtkeller reference was used for these rejections, the Milanesi et al. reference (6,040,736) appears to be equally applicable.

Fig. 1 discloses an NFET headswitch T coupled between a power supply and a load and operating as recited in claim 1. Feldtkeller does not specify an FET load circuit as recited in claim 1, however, the load circuit is described as a motor vehicle electronic unit. Motor vehicle electronic units are known to include microprocessor systems which inherently include FET devices and typically require supply regulation. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the circuit of Fig. 1 with an load circuit comprising at least one FET device for the benefit of providing the load circuit with a regulated supply voltage. Claim 1 is obvious.

Further shown is a charge pump LP as recited in claim 2 and functioning as recited in claims 3-6.

Claims 7 and 8 are given little weight since they define no specific parameters.

Claims 7 and 8 recite general relationships that are inherent to the disclosed circuit configuration.

Further disclosed is an op amp RV as recited in claim 10 and functioning as recited in claim 11.

As pointed out above, Fig. 1 is disclosed as useful for motor vehicle electronics, which includes microprocessors, digital signal processors, memory units and analog circuits as recited in claims 16, 17, 18 and 19. Alternately, all of theses applications typically require regulated supply voltages. Thus it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2816

ordinary skill at the art at the time of the invention to apply Fig. 1 to microprocessors, digital signal processors, memory units and analog circuits for the benefit of providing a regulated supply voltage to the microprocessors, digital signal processors, memory units and analog circuits. Claims 16, 17, 18 and 19 are obvious.

Claims 20, 21 and 22 are obvious for the reasons above.

As pointed out above, memory units (including SRAM) typically require regulated supply voltages. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the art at the time of the invention to apply Fig. 1 to SRAM circuits for the benefit of providing a regulated supply voltage to the SRAM circuits. Claim 23 is obvious.

Claim 24 is obvious for the reasons above.

CMOS technology of .13 um or smaller is a known, common technology. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Examiner's combination with such technology for the benefit of miniaturizing the circuit. As best understood, claim 25 is obvious.

Claims 26 and 27 are obvious for the reasons above.

Communication systems (including CDMA systems) typically require regulated supply voltages. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the art at the time of the invention to apply Fig. 1 to CDMA systems for the benefit of providing a regulated supply voltage to the CDMA systems. Claim 28 is obvious.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of Perelle et al. (6,295,189).

**Art Unit: 2816** 

Feldtkeller does not appear to disclose a plurality of NFET devices as recited in claim 9. It is generally known that circuit components may be duplicated for the benefit of increasing desirable circuit parameters. It is specifically know that duplicate parallel transistors may be implemented for the benefit of out performing a lone transistor. Perelle et al. Fig. 1, for example, discloses such a circuit 12m that out performs a lone transistor 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace NFET head switch T with a plurality of parallel head switches for the benefit of decreasing the ON resistance of the headswitch, increasing power delivered to the load and reducing power dissipated by the headswitch. Claim 9 is obvious.

6. Claim 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldtkeller in view of Flock (5,977,743).

Feldtkerller does not appear to disclose the ADC elements recited in claims 12
14. Flock Fig. 1 discloses a headswitch circuit including an NFET T1 with a charge pump boosted gate control analogous to Feldtkeller. Flock further discloses a charge pump GVS, an ADC MS/AD1 and a controller SS/ES all coupled together and forming a regulating feedback system as recited in claim 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement this feedback system into Feldtkeller as taught by Flock for the benefit of exerting digital control over circuit regulation. Claim 12 is obvious.

The combination functions as recited in claim 13. Furthermore, the recited digital target value is provided by SS and/or SE and/or SA.

The target value is programmable by way of SS and/or SE and/or SA as recited in claim 14.

#### Conclusion

- 7. The Nadd, Poma et al. and Kumpfmueller et al. references all clearly illustrate the principle of using a charge pump to boost the gate voltage of an NFET headswitch beyond the supply voltage. Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but may be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey S. Zweizig whose telephone number is (571) 272-1758. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Wednesday 6:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy P. Callahan can be reached on (571) 272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/617,897 Page 7

Art Unit: 2816

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey S. Zweizig Primary Examiner Art Unit 2816